#### NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

## COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

## **DIVISION ONE**

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE, D054078

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v. (Super. Ct. No. SCS222277)

JOSE EMANUEL MIRANDA,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Esteban Hernandez, Judge. Affirmed.

Jose Emanuel Miranda entered a negotiated guilty plea to grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (a)). As part of the plea bargain, the prosecution agreed to dismiss the remaining charges and enhancements. The parties stipulated to a two-year prison sentence. The trial court sentenced Miranda to two years in prison.

#### **FACTS**

Miranda admitted that on August 23, 2008, he "unlawfully stole over \$400 of personal property of another."

#### DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief setting forth evidence in the superior court. Counsel presents no argument for reversal, but asks that this court review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to possible, but not arguable, issues: (1) whether Miranda's guilty plea was constitutionally valid and whether this issue be raised on direct appeal; and (2) whether Miranda's sentence, which the parties stipulated to in the plea bargain, can be challenged without a certificate of probable cause.

We granted Miranda permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded.

A review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende*, *supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California*, *supra*, 386 U.S. 738, including the possible issues referred to by appellate counsel, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issues. Competent counsel has represented Miranda on this appeal.

# DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.	
WE CONCUR:	HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.
McINTYRE, J.	
IRION, J.	